

1
2 3. Investigation determined that on April 18, 2012, Thompson became the subject of a
3 Commission investigation stemming from a school district report of possible misconduct.
4 Records indicate Thompson was officially advised of the investigation on July 11, 2013, and
5 ultimately, Thompson was disciplined with a thirty day suspension of her license by the
6 Commission on June 25, 2015. Related to the same misconduct, on April 18, 2012,
7 Thompson's employment as a substitute teacher for the Beaverton School District was
8 terminated.

9
10 On June 27, 2014, Thompson made application for employment with RSD while knowingly
11 the subject of a Commission investigation. Thompson falsely responded "No" to background
12 questions on her RSD employment application, including questions regarding being under
13 investigation by a licensing agency and leaving any educational employment voluntarily or
14 involuntarily while the subject of an investigation. Thompson also failed to list the Beaverton
15 School District as a former employer on her RSD application as required.

16
17 On June 23, 2017, RSD administrators met with Thompson regarding her falsified
18 application and Thompson resigned her employment effective July 24, 2017.

19
20 4. On March 14, 2019, Commission investigator(s) notified Thompson that she was required to
21 participate in an interview regarding the 2017 allegations. On March 15, 2019, Thompson
22 contacted the investigator and advised that Thompson would be refusing to participate in any
23 interviews as requested.

24 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

25 Thompson's conduct described in section three (3) above constitutes gross neglect of duty in
26 violation of ORS 342.175(1)(b); OAR 584-020-0040(4)(n) as it incorporates OAR 584-020-0010(5)
27 (*Use professional judgment*), OAR 584-020-0025(2)(e) (*Using district lawful and reasonable rules*
28 *and regulations*); OAR 584-020-0040(4)(c) (*Falsification of any document or knowing*
29 *misrepresentation directly related to licensure, employment, or professional duties*); and OAR 584-
30 020-0040(o) as it incorporates OAR 584-020-0035(3)(a) (*Maintain the dignity of the profession by*
31 *respecting and obeying the law, exemplifying personal integrity and honesty*); This conduct also
32 constitutes gross unfitness is violation of ORS 342.175(1)(c); OAR 584-020-0040(5)(b) (*Fraud or*
33 *misrepresentations*).

34 Thompson's conduct described in section four (4) above constitutes gross neglect of duty in

1 violation of ORS 342.175(1)(b); OAR 584-020-0040(4)(p) (*Subject to the exercise of any legal right*
2 *or privilege, failure or refusal by an educator under investigation to respond to requests for*
3 *information, to furnish documents or to participate in interviews with a Commission*
4 *representative relating to a Commission investigation*).
5

6 The Commission's authority to impose discipline in this matter is based upon ORS 342.175.
7

8 **FINAL ORDER**
9

10 The Commission hereby suspends Arelys A. Thompson's educator licensure for a period of
11 ninety (90) days, to begin upon the date this order is signed and in effect.
12


13 In addition, the Commission places Thompson on probation for a period of three (3) years
14 to commence upon Thompson's reinstatement from suspension. This probation period is
15 subject to the following terms and conditions:
16

- 17 1. Thompson shall comply with the Standards for Competent and Ethical Performance of
18 Oregon Educators under Oregon Administrative Rules Chapter 584, Division 020.
19

20 Violation of any term or condition of probation shall constitute an independent basis for
21 the Commission to revoke Thompson's teaching license or otherwise impose discipline,
22 after first providing Thompson with notice and opportunity for hearing.
23

24
25 IT IS SO ORDERED THIS 7th day of October, 2019.
26

27 TEACHER STANDARDS AND PRACTICES COMMISSION

28 By: 
29 Dr. Anthony Rosilez, Executive Director
30
31
32
33
34

NOTICE OF APPEAL OR RIGHTS

1
2
3 YOU ARE ENTITLED TO JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THIS ORDER. JUDICIAL REVIEW MAY BE
4 OBTAINED BY FILING A PETITION FOR REVIEW WITHIN 60 DAYS FROM THE SERVICE OF
5 THIS ORDER. JUDICIAL REVIEW IS PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF ORS 183.482 TO
6 THE OREGON COURT OF APPEALS.